SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF AMENDED BILL

Franc	hico	Tav	Da	ard
Franc	:nise	ıax	BO	ara

Franchise Tax Board						
Author: Strickland	Analyst: Kristina North	Bill Number: AB 287				
See previous Related Bills: analysis	Telephone: 845-6978	Amended Date: March 10, 1999				
	Attorney: Doug Bramhall	Sponsor:				
SUBJECT: Agricultural Product		_ •				
introduced/amended	CCEPTED. Amendments reflect sugge	•				
X AMENDMENTS IMPACT REVENUE. A new revenue estimate is provided.						
AMENDMENTS DID NOT RESOLV introduced <u>February 4, 1999</u> .	AMENDMENTS DID NOT RESOLVE THE DEPARTMENT'S CONCERNS stated in the previous analysis of bill as introduced February 4, 1999.					
FURTHER AMENDMENTS NECESSARY.						
DEPARTMENT POSITION CHANGED TO						
X REMAINDER OF PREVIOUS ANALYSIS OF BILL AS INTRODUCED February 4, 1999, STILL APPLIES.						
X OTHER - See comments below.						
SUMMARY OF BILL						
Under the Personal Income Tax I (B&CTL), this bill would provide value of agricultural products organization or food bank. SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT	de an unlimited 100% cred	dit equal to the wholesale				
The March 10, 1999, amendment a credit to any taxpayer making a organization or food bank. A rethis amendment. Since the credimplementation concern requests co-ops is removed. Except for implementation concern, the remas introduced February 4, 1999,	an agricultural donation new revenue estimate is particuld now be available and whether the author in the new revenue estimate aninder of the departments	to a nonprofit charitable provided resulting from le to all taxpayers, the ntended to include farming e and the removal of the				
Implementation Considerat	ions					
Department staff previous and they are reprinted he	_	ving implementation concerns				
organizations," and "fo	ood bank." The author med in the California Foo	cts," "nonprofit charitable ay wish to consider using d and Agricultural Code				
Board Position: NA SA NA N OUA	NP NAR XPENDING	Department/Legislative Director Date Johnnie Lou Rosas 3/19/1999				

C:\WINDOWS\TEMP\AB 287 03-10-99 BA9F.DOC 03/29/99 12:28 PM

- ♦ It is unclear what constitutes "fair market value at wholesale," and a definition would avoid disputes between taxpayers and the department. For example, is it unclear if the market value should be calculated as of the time of donation or at the highest wholesale price of the year.
- ◆ This bill does not provide a process by which the donation of an agricultural product to a nonprofit charitable organization or food bank could be verified. Most credits require some method of verification, such as requiring the recipient organization to provide a written receipt with the type and quantity of product donated, name or names and of the donor or donors, the name and address of the recipient. The receipt should be available to the department upon request.

Department staff is available to assist in the resolution of these and any other concerns identified.

Tax Revenue Estimate

This bill is estimated to impact revenue as shown in the following table.

Fiscal Year Cash Flow					
Taxable/Income Years Beginning After December 31, 1998					
Enactment Assumed After June 30, 1999					
<pre>\$ Millions</pre>					
1999/2000	2000/2001	2001/2002			
(\$21)	(\$22)	(\$23)			

This analysis does not consider the possible changes in employment, personal income, or gross state product that could result from this bill.

Tax Revenue Discussion

The revenue impact for this bill will be determined by the wholesale value of donated agricultural products by taxpayers to charitable organizations, and the amount of credits that can be applied against available tax liabilities. Since wholesale values fluctuate throughout the year, the bill as written would not prevent taxpayers from claiming the highest value.

It was projected for the original bill that for every \$150 million in gross wholesale values claimed by farmers in contributions, the potential revenue loss would be around \$5 million. Since the bill lacks definitions, donated products could represent prior year inventory and current year production of comparable or lesser quality that is not readily marketable. Farmers that have operating losses for the year could provide for carryover credits for subsequent years. The order of magnitude loss, therefore, was projected to be as high as \$10 million annually (approximately \$300 million in claimed wholesale values).

The revenue losses shown above for the amended version also take into account other taxpayers, such as retailers and co-ops. For this segment, information on the former 10% donation credit was used. Revenue losses complied from historical data for 1989 through 1991 were approximately \$750,000 (excluding farmers) on average per year.

Assembly Bill 287 (Strickland) Amended March 10, 1999 Page 3

This revenue loss was grown and adjusted to reflect a 100% credit and gross wholesale values that would be allowed under this bill. This impact results in \$11 million for 1999. This number was added to the \$10 million estimated for farmers, leaving a total revenue loss of approximately \$21 million for income/taxable years beginning in 1999.

It is assumed that the transporting of usable, packaged goods (i.e. fruits, nuts, vegetables, rice, etc.) by taxpayers, co-ops, or by tax-exempt entities themselves would not be a significant obstacle, and that donations would have to be made in California. The value of current agricultural products donated to charitable organizations by taxpayers is not available.